

REMARKS

With the entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-7 are pending in the application. Favorable consideration is requested.

Claim 1 has been amended as supported by original claim 1 and throughout the specification, e.g., page 9, disclosing that the first and second layers are resin layers and that the second layer is imprisoned in the first layer (line 36). No new matter has been added. The claim amendments not only clarify the invention, but they also further distinguish it from anything disclosed or suggested by the prior art.

In response to the objections to claims 5 and 6 (in reference to claim 1), applicant submits that the amendments to claim 1 render the objections moot.

In response to the rejections of claims 1-6 as allegedly being anticipated by Hollis, and the rejection of claim 7 as allegedly being obvious over Hollis, applicant respectfully disagrees, but, in any event, submits that the amended claims clearly distinguish over any disclosures or suggestions of Hollis.

The claimed invention relates to objects made of plastic material and, more precisely, packaging. In contrast, Hollis relates to metallic protective wall structures. The claimed invention critically requires a synthetic resin multilayer structure comprising:

a first resin layer defining said faces and said borders,

a second resin layer, which is **imprisoned in the first layer**, of surface area at least equal to that of said faces,

wherein the second layer forms at least one zigzag-shaped double fold.

Hollis does not disclose (or suggest) these features of claim 1, from which all of the other claims depend.

As noted above, Hollis is directed to metallic protective wall structures, which are quite different than applicant's packaging structures. Although Hollis's structures may include a portion that is made of resin, such portion is a very minor part of the Hollis structure, i.e., only an adhesive layer (Hollis reference 35') that has the purpose to secure one element to another. All other basic elements of the Hollis structure (e.g., the plates) are not made of resin.

In contrast, the claimed invention is directed to a multilayer resin structure and requires – as its critical basic elements - two specific resin layers in a certain configuration. Hollis nowhere discloses (or suggests) such a structure or composition.

Moreover, applicant's claimed second resin layer is imprisoned in the first resin layer. In other words, as shown in applicant's Figures and as disclosed in the specification, the applicant's second resin layer is embedded in the first resin layer. This intimate relationship between layers is possible when using resins. This type of structure is not disclosed in Hollis, which simply shows a structure made of separate non-resin elements that are glued to each other. This Hollis structure is nothing like the claimed invention.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 (and its dependent claims) are not anticipated (or rendered obvious) by any disclosures or teachings of Hollis. As a result, applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner has any questions, the undersigned may be contacted at 703-816-4009.

THOMASSET
U.S. App. No. 10590201

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____



Duane M. Byers

Reg. No. 33,363

DMB:Imy

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100